

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering and initialing the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 7, 2007.

### **I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 25, and addresses each point of rejection raised by the Examiner.

The amended claim language finds support in the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-9 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong, U.S. Publication Application No. 2004/0127267.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 17 to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections.

Wong teaches a rotating user interface for a portable electronic device. However, the rotatable user interface sensor of Wong is configured differently from embodiments of the present invention. In Wong, a spring-loaded switch lever moves in one of two directions when force is applied, thereby opening and closing contacts, and springs back to a stationary position when the force is removed. The force is applied to the lever by a rotatable user interface comprising a plurality of teeth (see paragraphs [0052-0055] and Figs. 10 and 11).

Applicants respectfully submit that Wong does not disclose, teach, or suggest a plurality of dome switches that detects a contact signal when pressed, the dome switches being located on the opposite side of the PCB as the contact surfaces, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

Moreover, in embodiments of the present invention, the plurality of contact surfaces determines whether a rotating key is moving in a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction by measuring the sequence that the contact surfaces come into contact with a contact terminal. There is no bi-directional lever required in embodiments of the present invention to determine the direction of a rotating key as disclosed in Wong.

Therefore, Wong does not disclose, teach, or suggest a plurality of dome switches that detects a contact signal when pressed, the dome switches being located on the opposite side of the PCB as the contact surfaces. Moreover, Wong does not determine whether a rotating key is moving in a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction by measuring the sequence that the contact surfaces come into contact with a contact terminal.

Dependent claims 2-9 and 18-24 are distinguished from Wong for at least the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-9 and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**III. Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10-14 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong, in view of Arai, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0218738. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong, in view of Ritter, U.S. Patent No. 6,941,154.

Regarding independent claims 10, 14, and 25, secondary reference Arai also fails to disclose, teach, suggest, or render obvious the amended claim features of independent claims 10, 14 and 25.

Thus, the combination of Wong and Arai fails to teach each limitation of the amended claims 10, 14, and 25, or to even suggest each limitation. Nor would there be any apparent reason to combine Wong and Arai. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, 14, and 25 are patentable over the applied art.

Dependent claims 11-13 and 26-28 are distinguished from the cited references for at least the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 10 and 25, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 10-14 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong, in view of Ritter, U.S. Patent No. 6,941,154. Claims 15 and 16 are distinguished from the cited references for at least the reasons given above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 10-16 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul H. Nguyen-Ba  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: May 22, 2008